



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The possibility of another explanation of the absence of umlaut in *lêod* presents itself. It is that this word early went over to the *ô*-declension. In later WS. there is no doubt of this, for the nom. acc. pl. often end in *-a*.¹¹ Still, the usual ending in earlier texts is *-e*.¹² But the *ô*-declension, beside the usual form in *-a*, has nom. acc. pl. in *-e*.¹³ It is entirely possible that *lêod* very early went over to the *ô*-declension, thereby escaping the possibility of umlaut, and employed *-e* for the nom. acc. pl., an ending that later was not uncommon in this declension and that, indeed, was at all times the usual ending in Northern texts.

JAMES FINCH ROYSTER.

University of North Carolina.

OLD-FRENCH LITERATURE.

Chrestomathie de l'Ancien Français par L. CONSTANS. Third Edition. Paris and Leipzig : H. Welter, 1906, gr. 8°, 244 pages.

The third edition of Constans' *Chrestomathie* is all the more disappointing because so slight a change was needed to make the book the best of its kind in use. The edition is filled with misprints, to such a degree that we wonder if we have not been supplied with advance sheets of the new edition, rather than with the finished volume. It is evident, too, that several of the selections, such as the *Serments de Strasbourg* and the *Sainte Eulalie*, have not received the careful revision which the editor promises in his preface. I now proceed to mention with the utmost brevity a number of corrections and suggestions.

The words *Court Nez*, in the first sentence beginning on p. 7, should preferably be *Courb*

throughout the whole OE. period. WG. *liud-* = North. *lioda*. Bülbring, *op. cit.*, 111, 113. Cf. Sievers, *P. B. B.*, xviii, 411 ff.

¹¹ Cf., for instance, Aelfric, "Life of King Oswald," "pa leoda beheoldon"; "wolde gebigan his leoda . . ." (Bright, *Reader*, 99, 19; 103, 15); "Beowulf," 3001, etc. Cf. *Gr.*, 264.

¹² Cf. Bosworth-Toller, under *lêod*.

¹³ "Vespasian Psalter" (Sweet, *O. E. T.*, 338) has only *-e* (cf. *londleode* = *incolce*). Rushworth¹ has both *-a* and *-e*. *-æ* is the writing in the oldest texts. *Gr.*, 252, Anm. 1.

Nez. The opening sentence of the first paragraph of the right hand column on p. 8 is no longer to be admitted as true. In the same paragraph, the words: "sur les ennemis qui le poursuivaient" are inaccurate. In the first column of p. 9, in the eleventh line from the bottom, l. *Aliscans*, instead of the *Couronnement de Louis*. In line 98, p. 32, l. *recomandet*. The author states, in the note on p. 37, that the 1883 edition of the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* is the last one consulted by him. Similarly, the last edition utilized by him of Paris' *Extraits de la Chanson de Roland* is the fifth, tho there have been two subsequent editions. On p. 44, line 31, l. *agut*; p. 45, line 24: *espadles*. There seems to be a confusion in the dates assigned to *Huon de Bordeaux* in the note, p. 47. In line 22, p. 48, l. *hui*; line 73: *enterrai*; in line 80: *ja*; 82: *plaist*. The note concerning the *petit vers*, on line 48, p. 53, assumes too much for cautious criticism. There is an error in the numbering of line 110, p. 58. The editor does well in accepting the reading of P. Meyer for line 25, p. 60.

The *soi* of the following line, suggested by the same critic, is an elegant but not imperative reading. On the other hand, the *bien* of the ms. in line 16, which both P. Meyer and the editor reject, is probably correct: Ybert, whose language often has a vivid quality (cf. lines 1846-50 of *Raoul de Cambrai*) speaks ironically, hence the word *bien*. In the fourth line from the close of this page, l. *touz* and *dolans*; in the last line, *mou(l)t*, as also in line 101, p. 61, and elsewhere. In line 37, p. 61, l. *lecchierres*, and in line 50, *li*. On p. 62, line 27, l. *ot*, and on p. 63, line 6, *evesques*. Line 4 of the selection from Marie de France, p. 75, is preferably to be followed by a period. The interpretation given line 12, p. 76, is probably erroneous. The punctuation after *Tristan* in line 14 is a printer's blunder. In line 19 on this page, it is better to read *m'amastes*, and in line 40, *l'afaitai*; line 39 should be followed by a comma. It is better to close line 47 by a period, and line 49 by a comma. On p. 78, line 12, l. *faunt*, instead of *saut*, and in line 16, *remiré*, instead of *remisé*. A comma is necessary at the end of line 140, p. 79. Mention should be made under *Yvain*, on this page, of the source of the passage

cited, namely: lines 3341–3484 of the second edition of Foerster. The word *rains* of line 11, p. 80, should be commented on in the glossary or in the notes. There should be no circumflex accent over the vowel of *umilie* in line 64. The word *amor* of line 115, p. 81, shows one of the frequent printer's mistakes. On p. 82, line 133, l. *d'els*, and in line 138, *esleü*. The exclamation point in line 278, p. 84, should, of course, be omitted. On p. 87, line 55, l. *en* instead of *on*, and in line 94, l. *en* instead of *et*. In line 123, p. 88, l. *mervilleux*. On p. 90, line 21, the meaning is clearer if *folz* be followed by a semicolon or a period, and there should be a comma at the end of line 52 on the next page. The editor's correction in line 65, p. 98, is hardly defensible.

It is perhaps best to see in the words *a remuier*, p. 100, line 20 of the second column, the meaning of "in quantity," given by Godefroy. There should be no circumflex accent over the vowel of *si* in line 8, p. 107. One may doubt the explanation offered in the glossary for the *a la coule* of line 94, p. 109. In line 162, l. *veillier*. The note at the bottom of the right hand column of p. 110 should read: "VIII, 24 sqq." The last word of line 5, in the left hand column of p. 111 should be *chier*. The notes ought to cite the fable mentioned in stanza viii on this page. In the note at the bottom of p. 119, l.: "t. I. 250 sqq." On p. 124, the period has been omitted at the end of line 56, and the interrogation point in line 98 should be replaced by a period. The comma at the end of line 30, p. 126, should be replaced by a dash or a period. In the heading before line 99, p. 127, l. *li chevaliers*. There should be a comma instead of a period at the end of line 125. Line 57, p. 134, should be followed by a comma. In line 15, p. 135, second column, l. *n'i* instead of *vi*. It is necessary to place a comma at the end of line 63. On p. 140, line 5, l. *raison*. In the eighth line of the note, p. 141, l. *un*. In line 47, p. 142, l. *homme*, and in line 80 of the following page, l. *honoree*. In lines 13 and 17, p. 148, l. *la* and *li*. The punctuation after *paour* in line 30, p. 150, is to be effaced. In line 93, p. 151, l. *Ou*. In line 13, p. 153, l. *sillabes*. The thought gains if the word *color* of line 38 on this page be retained. On p. 154, second column, line 18, l. *connissance*.

The comma at the end of line 78, p. 155, is to be replaced by a period, and that in line 50 of the following page, by a semicolon.

There are a number of errors in the glossary, and even the list of errata (p. 241) is not free from them! The glossary is poorly constructed in two ways: it should give the quantity of the Latin vowels, and page and column should be used in citing the passages where the various words are to be found. It is hard to see why so many chrestomathies contain glossaries whose references are according to the number of the selection, a method which requires three times as long to use intelligently as the method by page and column. As to the quantity of the Latin vowels, it is a thing which the student can not see too often or know too well.

Let us hope that Professor Constans will soon offer a genuinely revised edition of the *Chrestomathie*, which can easily be made the best on the market. In fact, it contains the best selection of texts of all the chrestomathies of Old French, and the notes show unusually sound judgment and careful scholarship. Indeed, were it not for the many real excellencies of the *Chrestomathie*, one would feel less aggravation at the manner in which it has been revised.

RAYMOND WEEKS.

University of Missouri.

Richard Wagner. Von MAX KOCH, Professor an der Universität Breslau. Bd. I. Berlin, Ernst Hofman & Co., 1907. vii + 392 pp.

The time has come when the importance of Richard Wagner in the literature of the nineteenth century—and not merely in the development of music—is recognized by all thoughtful critics. Consequently the appearance of a new Wagner-biography by a historian of literature of the rank of Max Koch is an event of considerable moment. Glasenapp's basic work had given the world for the first time a detailed statement of Wagner's evolution from the point of view of a personal friend, much as did Kuh's biography of Hebbel. H. S. Chamberlain in his "Richard Wagner" (first ed., 1895) presented a purely intellectual conception, dividing his book into three sections,